

Application No. 10/757,700
Response to Office Action dated September 4, 2008

Docket No.: 0630-1926P

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 23-35 are pending in the present application. Claims 2-5 and 7-22 have been canceled and claims 23-35 have been added by the present amendment. No new matter has been added.

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejection

Claims 2-5, 7-9, 11, 14, 15 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat et al. in view of Park et al. Claims 10, 12, 13, 16, 21 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Traversat et al. in view of Park et al. and further in view of Rosen et al. Because claims 2-5 and 7-22 have been canceled, these rejections are moot.

Claims Added

Claims 23-35 have been added for the Examiner's consideration.

Independent claim 23 recites a combination of features in a method of communication between mobile terminals including establishing a communication link between a first mobile terminal and a second mobile terminal through Internet Protocol (IP) addressing in order to access open information stored in the second mobile terminal, the open information being allowed to be accessed from the second mobile terminal; displaying, on a screen of the first mobile terminal, the open information accessed from the second mobile terminal to allow a user of the first mobile terminal to select at least one information item in the displayed open information; and obtaining, from the second mobile terminal, the information item selected by the user of the first mobile terminal to be used in establishing a communication link between the first mobile terminal and a third mobile terminal via a mobile telecommunications network. Similarly, independent claim 29 recites a combination of elements in a mobile terminal system

Application No. 10/757,700
Response to Office Action dated September 4, 2008

Docket No.: 0630-1926P

including communication means configured to establish a connection between a first mobile terminal and a second mobile terminal via an Internet Protocol (IP) network to access open information stored in the second mobile terminal, the open information being allowed to be accessed from the second mobile terminal; and a screen configured to display the open information accessed from the second mobile terminal to allow a user of the first mobile terminal to select at least one information item in the displayed open information, wherein the communication means and the display cooperate to allow the user of the first mobile terminal to establish a connection with a mobile telecommunication network to contact a third mobile terminal using the selected information item, and wherein the contact to the third mobile terminal can be performed without inquiring a user of the second mobile terminal. Applicant respectfully submits that these features as set forth in independent claims 23 and 29 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Traversat et al. teaches a peer-to-peer network that allows communication between devices and exchange of information stored in each device. However, as acknowledged by the Office Action, Traversat et al. fails to teach accessing open information stored in the second mobile terminal, wherein the open information is allowed to be accessed from the second mobile terminal. Thus, the Office Action further combines Traversat et al. with Park et al. states that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to add open information is transmitted through a wireless communication network based on a phone number. Park et al. teaches a Voice over Internet protocol (VoIP) services where a user can dial a phone number to call another party through internet. However, Park et al. only teaches a phone number transmitted by a terminal is converted to a domain name and an IP address corresponding to the domain name is requested to allow the phone number to be unique worldwide. Thus, although communication of information takes place in Park et al., Park does not teach accessing of such information that the information obtained from the second terminal by a user of the first mobile terminal is the information used to establish a communication link between the first mobile terminal and a third mobile terminal. Therefore, Traversat et al., even when combined with Park et al., fails to teach or suggest obtaining, from the second mobile terminal, the information item selected by the user of the first mobile terminal to be used in establishing a communication link

Application No. 10/757,700
Response to Office Action dated September 4, 2008

Docket No.: 0630-1926P

between the first mobile terminal and a third mobile terminal via a mobile telecommunications network, as recited in independent claims 23 and 29.

Further, Rosen et al. fails to overcome these deficiencies of Traversat et al. and Park et al. Rosen et al. was relied on by the Office Action to show receiving information through a CDMA network. However, Rosen et al. fails to teach or suggest obtaining, from the second mobile terminal, the information item selected by the user of the first mobile terminal to be used in establishing a communication link between the first mobile terminal and a third mobile terminal via a mobile telecommunications network, as recited in independent claims 23 and 29.

Applicant also submits that claims 24-28 and 30-35 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 23 and 29, respectively, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from claims 23 and 29 are believed to be allowable. In addition, claims 24-28 and 30-35 recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art references.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted independent claims 23 and 29, and each of the claims depending therefrom are allowable.

Application No. 10/757,700
Response to Office Action dated September 4, 2008

Docket No.: 0630-1926P

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.


If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Jun S. Ha, Registration No. 58,508, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: December 4, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant